



California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Lahontan Region



Alan C. Lloyd, Ph.D.

Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, California 96150
(530) 542-5400 • Fax (530) 544-2271
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan>

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

December 23, 2004

To Interested Parties:

SCOPING MEETING FOR PROPOSED WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN AMENDMENTS TO INCORPORATE A TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR SEDIMENT FOR SQUAW CREEK, PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Squaw Creek is located in the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit, Placer County, California. Lahontan Regional Board staff are preparing draft amendments to the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan) to incorporate a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for sediment and develop an implementation plan to meet water quality objectives for Squaw Creek. The proposed amendments would include hillslope and instream targets and assign load allocations to the various sediment sources. The implementation plan will outline the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board's (Regional Board's) approach to meeting the targets and allocations. The plan will describe the regulatory actions the Regional Board would take and identify what actions dischargers in the watershed must take to reduce sediment discharges to Squaw Creek. Additionally, Basin Plan waste discharge prohibition language would be amended to allow discharges that meet the requirements of a TMDL (specific to the watershed of concern) to surface waters and lands within the 100-year floodplain of the Truckee River Hydrologic unit.

The Basin Plan amendment will not by itself require the implementation of any specific project and the Regional Board will not directly undertake any actions that could physically change the environment. Adopting the proposed Basin Plan amendment could indirectly result in local entities within the watershed selecting specific projects to satisfy the requirements of the Basin Plan amendment. These projects could physically change the environment. The Regional Board is required by CEQA to analyze impacts and mitigation measures that are a reasonably foreseeable consequence of adopting the Basin Plan amendment. The Secretary for Resources has certified the State Board's water quality planning process as "functionally equivalent" to the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report or other CEQA document (Public Resources Code (PRC) 21080.5 and California Code of Regulation (CCR) Title 14, 15251(g)).

CEQA Section 21083.9 requires scoping meetings for projects of statewide, regional or areawide significance. The purpose of a scoping meeting is to provide a forum for lead agencies, jurisdictional agencies and interested parties to comment on the scope and content of the environmental information to be analyzed during the CEQA process. Scoping can be helpful in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth and in eliminating from detailed study those issues found not to be important. An initial evaluation of possible environmental impacts are enclosed to help focus discussion on the environmental issues as they affect CEQA analysis. **Comments on the technical merits of the TMDL and Basin Plan amendments will not be entertained at the scoping meeting.** Regional Board staff plan to release public drafts of the Basin Plan amendments, technical staff report and environmental document for a 45-day review period. **Regional board staff will entertain general comments related to the TMDL during the forthcoming review of public drafts.** A public hearing and Regional Board action on amendments will follow the public comment period.

California Environmental Protection Agency

Scoping Meeting
Squaw Creek
Placer County

-2-

A scoping meeting for this project has been scheduled on **Wednesday, January 26, 2005** at the Truckee Town Hall; please see the enclosed notice for additional information. CEQA trustee agencies and other interested parties may also submit written comments on the scope and content of the environmental document to the attention of Jill Wilson at the address above, or via email at Jwilson@waterboards.ca.gov. Written comments must be received by **February 7, 2005** in order to be considered in preparation of the public draft environmental document.

The Regional Board staff contact person for the proposed amendments is Jill Wilson. Please contact her at (530) 542-5449, or the email address above, if you have any questions about the proposed amendments.

Sincerely,

Bud Amorfini
Senior Environmental Scientist
Watershed Planning/TMDL Unit Chief

cc (w/encls.): Ling Tseng, Division of Water Quality, SWRCB

JW/dcc T:\TMDLS\Squaw Ck TMDL\Scoping Ltr Final.DOC
[Annex (Basin Plan-Squaw Creek)].

California Environmental Protection Agency



**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
LAHONTAN REGION**

2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96152
(5303) 542-5400

NOTICE OF CEQA SCOPING MEETING

In the Matter of a Proposed Amendment
To the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Regional Board) staff will hold a CEQA scoping meeting pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 21083.9, as amended by AB 1532 to receive comments on the appropriate scope and content of the “functionally equivalent” environmental document to be prepared pursuant to Section 21080.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The proposed amendment would involve:

- Incorporation of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and implementation plan for sediment for Squaw Creek, Placer County, California and amendment of the Truckee River Hydrologic unit waste discharge prohibition language to allow discharges that meet the requirements of a TMDL (specific to the watershed of concern) to surface waters and lands within the 100-year floodplain.

The **scoping meeting** will be held:

DATE: January 26, 2005
TIME: 5:30 – 7:30 PM
LOCATION: Truckee Town Council Chambers

Any person who is disabled and requires special accommodations to participate in the scoping meeting, please contact Pam Walker at (530) 542-5406 no later than 10 days before the scheduled meeting.

Bud Amorfini
Senior Environmental Scientist
Watershed Planning/TMDL Unit Chief

Date: _____

INITIAL EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | | X |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | X |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | | X |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | | X |
| II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |
| III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | X |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | | X |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | | X |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | | X |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | X |
| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | X | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | | X | | |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | X | | |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | X | | |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | | X |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | X |
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5? | | X | | |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? | | X | | |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | X | | |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | X | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | | | | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | X |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | X |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | X | | |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | | X | | |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | | X |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | | | | X |
| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project: | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | X |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | | X |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | | X |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | X |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | X | | |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | | X |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | X | | |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | | X |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | | X |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | X | | |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | X |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | | X |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |
| IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | | X |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | X |
| X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | | X |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | | | | X |
| XI. NOISE: Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | | X |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | X |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | X | | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |
| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | | X |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES | | | | |
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
| Fire protection? | | | | X |
| Police protection? | | | | X |
| Schools? | | | | X |
| Parks? | | | | X |
| Other public facilities? | | | | X |
| XIV. RECREATION -- | | | | |
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | | X |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | | X |
| XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | | | X | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | X |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | | X |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | X |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | X |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | | | | X |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | | | | X |
| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | X |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | X | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | | X |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments? | | | | X |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs? | | | | X |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | X |
| XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -- | | | | |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | X | | |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | | | X | |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | | X |

IV. Biological Resources

a-b) The Basin Plan amendment is designed to benefit biological resources, including wildlife and rare and endangered species. Local entities proposing projects would conduct environmental review and identify necessary mitigation measures as needed to protect habitats, special-status species, or sensitive communities.

c) If, pursuant to requirements derived from the proposed Basin Plan Amendment, specific projects were to be proposed involving construction or earthmoving activities that could adversely affect wetlands, then local entities should obtain necessary permits and incorporate necessary mitigation measures through their environmental reviews.

d) Project proponents would ensure that mitigation measures are implemented, such as avoiding construction during the breeding season, avoiding sensitive habitat areas, and minimizing disturbances.

V. Cultural Resources

a-d) If necessary to protect historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, local entities would require mitigation through their environmental reviews.

VI. Geology and Soils

b) It is not anticipated that there would be any substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil resulting from projects proposed by dischargers complying with the Basin Plan amendment. The intent of the Basin Plan amendment is to provide long term decreases in soil erosion and loss of topsoil in order to benefit the beneficial uses of Squaw Creek. However, as dischargers propose projects in order to comply with the Basin Plan amendment, their project design should address measures to mitigate temporary erosion.

c) Local entities proposing projects to comply with requirements derived from the Basin Plan amendment should design their project and propose mitigation measures as necessary to minimize any potential for landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

a) The project would amend the Basin Plan, which articulates applicable water quality standards. Future projects resulting from the amendment should be designed to meet all applicable water quality standards and permit requirements. Future project proponents should incorporate mitigation measures as deemed necessary during their project reviews.

c) Earthmoving projects proposed to meet the proposed Basin Plan amendment targets would be designed to reduce overall soil erosion. Project proponents should ensure that mitigation measures are implemented, such as dust suppression (e.g., spraying water), use of erosion control best management practices, and proper construction site management. In addition, construction projects over 1 acre in size would require a general construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and implementation of a storm water pollution prevention plan.

f) As local entities propose implementation projects, they should obtain the necessary permits and propose project specific mitigation measures such as erosion control and construction site BMPS in order to comply with CEQA requirements.

XI. Noise

d) If necessary, local entities could require that noise reduction mitigation measures be implemented, such as restricting the hours of noise-generating operations.

XVI. Utilities and Service

c) In order to comply with the Basin Plan amendments, local dischargers may propose constructing new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. At the time of project design and environmental review, the responsible discharger should propose mitigations for any potentially significant environmental effects resulting from this type of activity.

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) As specific implementation proposals are developed and proposed, project proponents should undertake environmental review and identify specific environmental impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. In cases where potential impacts could be significant, project proponents should adopt mitigation measures to ensure that possible impacts would be less-than-significant.